

ORIGINAL

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION/ 2 **COMMISSIONERS** Arizona Corporation Commission 2003 OCT 29 ₱ 1: 38 3 MARC SPITZER, Chairman DOCKETED WILLIAM A. MUNDELL JEFF HATCH-MILLER OCT 2 9 2003 MIKE GLEASON 5 KRISTIN K. MAYES DOCKETED BY DOCKET NO. S-03464A-03-0000 6 IN THE MATTER OF: 7 MUTUAL BENEFITS CORPORATION, **SIXTH** PROCEDURAL ORDER 8 Respondents. BY THE COMMISSION: On April 30, 2003, the Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation 10 Commission ("Commission") filed a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing ("Notice") against Mutual 11 Benefits Corporation ("MBC" or "Respondent"), in which the Division alleged multiple violations of 12 the Arizona Securities Act ("Act") in connection with the offer and sale of securities in the form of 13 life and viatical settlements ("viaticals") and/or investment contracts. 14 The Respondent was duly served with a copy of the Notice. 15 On May 13, 2003, a request for hearing was filed for MBC. 16 On May 15, 2003, by Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled. 17 On May 28, 2003, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for 18 19 More Definite Statement ("Motion to Dismiss or More Definite Statement"). 20 On June 4, 2003, Respondent filed a Motion to Quash Subpoena ("Motion to Quash") of third 21 party, Ms. Debbie Bugliera. The subpoena issued to Ms. Bugliera was issued on May 6, 2003 after 22 the Notice herein was issued. The subpoena references this proceeding on its face and a copy was not served on the Respondent. Subsequently, Ms. Bugliera did not appear in response to the Division's 23

On June 5, 2003, the Division and the Respondent appeared by counsel to address issues raised in the proceeding. The parties agreed that a second pre-hearing conference should be scheduled in early August, 2003 after some initial discovery had taken place in order that a hearing

could be scheduled once the approximate number of witnesses was determined and whether certain

subpoena to give testimony under oath and Respondent filed the Motion to Quash herein.

24

25

26

27

28

4

7

6

9

8

11 12

10

13

14 15

16 17

19

18

20 21

23 24

22

25

27

28

26

Accordingly, the proceeding should be scheduled for hearing during April 2004.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the hearing shall commence on April 7, 2004, at 9:30 a.m., at the Commission's offices, 1200 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall also set aside April 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19,

matters could be resolved by stipulation. By Procedural Order, a pre-hearing conference was scheduled on August 5, 2003.

On June 9, 2003, the Division filed its Response to the Motion to Dismiss or More Definite Statement.

On June 17, 2003, the Division filed its Response in opposition to the Respondent's Motion to Ouash. While presenting a number of legal arguments against the Motion to Quash, the Division acknowledged that "Pre-hearing discovery in agency proceedings is a matter of agency discretion."

On June 20, 2003, Respondent filed its Reply to the Division's Response to the Motion to Dismiss or More Definite Statement.

On June 24, 2003, the Respondent filed its Reply to the Division's Response essentially restating its earlier arguments that the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure ("ARCP") should apply as stated by Commission rule, A.A.C. R14-3-109(P).

On June 27, 2003, by Procedural Order, the Motion to Quash was not granted, but Respondent's counsel was granted an opportunity to participate as set forth in the ARCP if the subpoena is reinstated.

On July 3, 2003, by Procedural Order, the Commission denied Respondent's Motion for More Definite Statement and took under advisement MBC's Motion to Dismiss.

On August 5, 2003, a pre-hearing conference was held with the Respondent and the Division appearing through counsel. The parties agreed that more time for discovery was needed and further agreed to a status conference on September 23, 2003, which was subsequently ordered by Procedural Order.

On September 23, 2003, at the status conference, the scheduling of the proceeding was discussed and the respective counsel agreed that the proceeding should be scheduled during April 2004, and estimated the time required for hearing will be between three and four weeks.

1	20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28 and 29, 2004 for additional days of hearing, if necessary.
2	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for the respective parties shall exchange copies of
3	their exhibits, witness lists and summaries of each witnesses' testimony and provide a courtesy copy
4	of same to the presiding Administrative Law Judge by March 5, 2004.
5	DATED thisday of October, 2003.
6	
7	Mezz
8	MARC E. STERN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
9	
10	Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered this day of October, 2003 to:
11	Paul J. Roshka, Jr.
12	Alan S. Baskin James M. McGuire
13	One Arizona Center
14	400 East Van Buren Street, Ste. 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004
15	Attorneys for Respondent
16	Matt Neubert, Acting Director Securities Division
17	ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1300 West Washington Street
18	Phoenix, AZ 85007
19	Arizona Reporting Service, Inc. 2627 N. Third Street, Suite Three
20	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1103
21	10.08/1 11.0
22	By: VVV ()/VVV ()/VVV ()/VVVV ()/VVVVVVVVVV
23	Secretary to Marc E. Stern
24	
25	
26	
27	